Research Analysis & Assessment Report

RAAR

The article is accepted

Author

Daryono Daryono

University/Institution

Mulawarman University

Title of Research

The Development of Business Organization Through the Effective Network

Management. Case Study at SMEs Cluster in Indonesia

THEME
OVERALL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH ON THE CORE PARAMETERS

SECTION A.1 — INTEGRITY & ANALYSIS OF THEME
HOW IMPACTFUL IS THIS THEME

86.99 /150.00	88.59 /150.00	87.79 /150.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.1 — THEME ANALYSIS AND EXPLORATION
HOW AUTHOR HAS ANALYZED AND, EXPLORED THE THEME OF THE RESEARCH?

17.71 /30.00	18.05 /30.00	17.88 /30.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.2 — CONCEPT ORIGINALITY/BREAKTHROUGH
THIS DOES NOT REFER TO PLAGIARISM. THIS MEANS HOW MUCH ENHANCED IN FIELD AUTHOR HAS MADE WITH RESPECT TO THE PREVIOUS REFERENCED RESEARCH

11.55 /20.00	11.77 /20.00	11.66 /20.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.3 — PRESENTED CONCEPT
THIS MEASURES HOW MUCH SUFFICIENTLY NOVEL IS THE ARTICLE AND HAS ADDED NEW KNOWLEDGE TO THE STREAM

11.49 /20.00	11.70 /20.00	11.60 /20.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.4 — HOW FUNDAMENTAL THE CONCEPT IS?
HOW CLOSE THE CONCEPT IS TO THE FUNDAMENTAL FOUNDATION OR BASIS OF THE CORRESPONDING RESEARCH IN THE STREAM? GIVEN MORE MARK IF IT IS MORE FUNDAMENTAL.

05.78 /10.00	05.89 /10.00	05.84 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.5 — DEPTH OF THE RESEARCH
THE DEPTH OF THEME AND RESEARCH WORK

17.49 /30.00	17.80 /30.00	17.65 /30.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.6 — The scope of stream

How is the article related to the scope of the stream?

06.13 /10.00	06.21 /10.00	06.17 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.7 — Meaningful interpretation of the results

How logically has the author interpreted the results of the study

06.01 /10.00	06.13 /10.00	06.07 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.8 — Logical Conclusions

Were any logical conclusions made by the author?

05.24 /10.00	05.37 /10.00	05.31 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.1.9 — Relevance of the Article

How relevant is the research topic is with respect to the current needs in the stream?

| 05.59 /10.00	05.67 /10.00	05.63 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.2 — Extensibility of Research

20.25 /35.00	20.52 /35.00	20.39 /35.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.2.1 — Flexibility of Theory

The consistency of the conclusion with respect to the theory

08.49 /15.00	08.61 /15.00	08.55 /15.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.2.2 — FUTURE ASPECTS OF RESEARCH
WHETHER THE RESEARCH TOPIC IS A HOT TOPIC OF ITS STREAM

05.59/10.00	05.67/10.00	05.63/10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.2.3 — FLEXIBILITY OF INPUT DATA
IF THE RESULTS ARE CONSISTENT EVEN IF THE INPUT DATA IS CHANGED

06.17/10.00	06.24/10.00	06.21/10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.3 — APPLICATION OF RESEARCH

21.05/35.00	21.30/35.00	21.18/35.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.3.1 — DIRECT IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH TO INDUSTRIES
HOW MUCH THE RESEARCH IMPACTS DIRECTLY TO THE INDUSTRIES FOR THEIR BETTERMENT

09.02/15.00	09.12/15.00	09.07/15.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.3.2 — APPLICATIONS TO INTERDISCIPLINARY STREAMS
HOW MUCH IS THE RESEARCH USEFUL FOR MULTIPLE STREAMS

08.89/15.00	08.98/15.00	08.94/15.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION A.3.3 — COMPATIBILITY WITH LOCAL LAWS
IT SHOULD NOT BREAK ANY LOCAL LAWS, TAKE US LAWS IF UNKNOWN

03.14/05.00	03.20/05.00	03.17/05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Structural and Compilation Gradation of Article

Formatting is publisher's job, evaluation of the following is based on the layout of the article

SECTION B.1 — INTERACTIVITY

How impactful is this Theme

37.85 /60.00	38.93 /60.00	38.39 /60.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.1 — PROPER HEADING

How author has analyzed and explored theme of the research?

06.65 /10.00	06.83 /10.00	06.74 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.2 — FIGURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Relevance of theme and no figure should lack captions

06.23 /10.00	06.40 /10.00	06.32 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.3 — CHARTS AND TABLES

Properly and nicely formatted

06.11 /10.00	06.25 /10.00	06.18 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.4 — HIGH RESOLUTION OF IMAGES

More than 600 DPI (Dot Per Inch). Means graphics must not be blurry

06.11 /10.00	06.28 /10.00	06.20 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.5 — ASPECT RATIO

The ratio of the width to the height of an image must be correct

06.29 /10.00	06.54 /10.00	06.42 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.1.6 — Vector images in case of illustrative figures

If figures are not photographs, they must be in vector format

06.46 /10.00	06.63 /10.00	06.55 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2 — Title, Abstract and Keywords

12.24 /20.00	12.68 /20.00	12.46 /20.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.1 — Title

The title of the paper effectively frames the study

01.77 /03.00	01.82 /03.00	01.80 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.2 — Contains specific data

It should be relevant and summary of whole article

01.10 /02.00	01.14 /02.00	01.12 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.3 — Single paragraph

It should be only of single paragraph Screen reader support enabled.

00.59 /01.00	00.61 /01.00	00.60 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.4 — 250 words or less

250 words or less are considered better

01.15 /02.00	01.18 /02.00	01.17 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.5 — Grammar and spelling
Scientific terminologies used are correct and consistent

00.57 /01.00	00.59 /01.00	00.58 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.6 — Clear and concise
It should have good readability

01.82 /03.00	01.90 /03.00	01.86 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.7 — Translated to English
Title, abstract and keywords should be in English also even if the article is non-English.

02.55 /04.00	02.65 /04.00	02.60 /04.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.2.8 — Keywords
Keywords should be used correctly and consistently

02.69 /04.00	02.79 /04.00	02.74 /04.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3 — Introduction Section

08.58 /15.00	08.86 /15.00	08.72 /15.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.1 — Background
Background and history of the topic should be well summarized

01.71 /03.00	01.76 /03.00	01.74 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.2 — Appropriate depth
It should go into the proper details

01.83/03.00	01.87/03.00	01.85/03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.3 — Goal clearly stated
What a reader should expect from the article should also be stated

01.47/03.00	01.55/03.00	01.51/03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.4 — References cited
Reference in standard format like APA.

01.17/02.00	01.20/02.00	01.19/02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.5 — Transition and flow
Content in introduction should be connecting, logical, clear, easy to follow

01.12/02.00	01.17/02.00	01.15/02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.6 — Grammar and spelling
Semantic report is sent separately, still you can judge

00.62/01.00	00.63/01.00	00.63/01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.3.7 — Sentence/paragraph structure
Subheadings in Introduction Section

00.66/01.00	00.68/01.00	00.67/01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Material & Methods Section

06.49 /10.00	06.73 /10.00	06.61 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Complete and Detailed
Method specified should be reproducible

02.67 /04.00	02.78 /04.00	02.73 /04.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Reference cited
References are given in a standard style. For example, APA

01.06 /02.00	01.11 /02.00	01.09 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Correct format
Method should be well structured

01.45 /02.00	01.49 /02.00	01.47 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Grammar and Spelling
Thorough semantic report is sent separately, still this parameter is judged

00.63 /01.00	00.65 /01.00	00.64 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

Sentence/paragraph structure
Separate subsections for material and procedure

00.68 /01.00	00.70 /01.00	00.69 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5 — ARTICLE CONTENT

13.20 /20.00	13.61 /20.00	13.41 /20.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5.1 — APPROPRIATE LENGTH

LENGTH OF THE ARTICLE SHOULD NEITHER BE TO LONG NOR TOO SHORT DEPENDING ON THE TYPE OF ARTICLE (REVIEW/ORIGINAL).

03.25 /05.00	03.38 /05.00	03.32 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5.2 — REFERENCE CITED

REFERENCES ARE GIVEN IN A STANDARD STYLE IN THE WHOLE ARTICLE. FOR EXAMPLE, APA

02.02 /03.00	02.07 /03.00	02.05 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5.3 — TRANSITION AND FLOW

ARTICLE'S CONTENTS SHOULD BE CONNECTING, LOGICAL, CLEAR, EASY TO FOLLOW

01.36 /02.00	01.40 /02.00	01.38 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5.4 — GRAMMAR AND SPELLING

THOROUGH SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL THIS PARAMETER IS JUDGED FOR THE WHOLE ARTICLE

03.16 /05.00	03.27 /05.00	03.22 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.5.5 — SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE

PROPER STRUCTURE OF THE WHOLE ARTICLE

03.41 /05.00	03.49 /05.00	03.45 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6 — RESULTS SECTION
If results section is not required, mark NR

06.20 /10.00	06.30 /10.00	06.25 /10.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.1 — WELL ORGANIZED RESULTS
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS SECTION

01.87 /03.00	01.90 /03.00	01.89 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.2 — CLEAR AND CONCISE
IT SHOULD HAVE GOOD READABILITY

01.24 /02.00	01.26 /02.00	01.25 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.3 — ACCURACY OF RESULTS IN PRIMA FACIE
IF RESULT DATA LOOKS CORRECT

00.61 /01.00	00.62 /01.00	00.62 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.4 — STANDALONE READABILITY
CAN ANYONE READ RESULTS SECTION WITHOUT READING WHOLE ARTICLE?

01.24 /02.00	01.26 /02.00	01.25 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.5 — GRAMMAR AND SPELLING
SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL YOU CAN JUDGE

00.62 /01.00	00.63 /01.00	00.63 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.6.6

SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE
Separate subsections for material and procedure

00.62 /01.00	00.63 /01.00	00.63 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION SECTION
How impactful is this Theme

18.99 /30.00	19.41 /30.00	19.20 /30.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.1

OVERALL DISCUSSION
Conclusion, merits and demerits of the research should be clearly stated

03.45 /05.00	03.55 /05.00	03.50 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.2

INTEGRATION WITH THEORY
How is the conclusion related to the theory presented in the article

01.23 /02.00	01.26 /02.00	01.25 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.3

REFERENCES CITED IN THE COMMENTS SECTION
Reference in standard format like APA

01.36 /02.00	01.40 /02.00	01.38 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.4

CONCISE AND APPROPRIATE
Authors arrived at clear, well-supported and evidence-based

02.02 /03.00	02.07 /03.00	02.05 /03.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.5 — Logical conclusions

Conclusion deduced should be logically correct and obvious

02.93 /05.00	03.01 /05.00	02.97 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.6 — Grammar and spelling

Thorough semantic report is sent separately, still this parameter is judged for the conclusion section

00.63 /01.00	00.65 /01.00	00.64 /01.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.7 — Dissenting arguments scope

Better if variance of expressed opinions with the tradition is high

03.07 /05.00	03.11 /05.00	03.09 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.8 — Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement and conflict of interest should be stated

01.23 /02.00	01.25 /02.00	01.24 /02.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION B.7.9 — References/Bibliography

Literature Cited section should have complete citation information in standard format

03.07 /05.00	03.11 /05.00	03.09 /05.00
Reviewer I	Reviewer II	Average

SECTION C — To be Filled by Editor

06.65 /15.00	Verified by Registrar	06.65 /15.00
Editor		

SECTION C.1 — Number of Authors
Number of Corresponding Authors (MM: 10)

Editor	Verified by Registrar	
02.79 /05.00		02.79 /05.00

SECTION C.2 — Author's credibility
Authors having PhD (MM: 15)

Editor	Verified by Registrar	
01.18 /05.00		01.18 /05.00

SECTION C.3 — Corresponding author's country's contribution to research

Editor	Verified by Registrar	
02.68 /05.00		02.68 /05.00

SECTION D — Total & Grade

SECTION D.1

Total	Grade
241.05 /400	A

Dear Author,

We appreciate your article submission entitled:

'The Development of Business Organization Through the Effective Network Management. Case Study at SMEs Cluster in Indonesia'

Reviewer 2

The topic is timely and will be of interest to the readers of the journal. The review of the literature is not thorough so the reader is not given an adequate background about the topic. It can be improved. The article is well written, treats an actual problem. Author enjoyed writing this article, and is very well received by reviewer. Eloquent, clear, persuasive, interesting, was capturing the interest in the whole article and fires the imagination of readers.

We are happy to inform you that your paper was accepted. The venue received a great many submissions of high quality. Each submission was thoroughly and extensively reviewed by our expert panels. After week-long online and offline discussions, we selected a small subset of papers to be accepted. Your paper was one of them.

The article describes that And, I certainly agree with it.

Your article is with the RAAR report. As such, your paper will see expedited publishing in the Global Journals Incorporated, United States' Social Science journal, a high impact journal in the field.

As it comes to your paper, it is perfect as is. Still, we have enclosed detailed reviews of your paper below. We hope that these will help you in your future work and look forward to your paper's final version at the time of early view!

Editorial 1

Suitable for publication in its current form. This can be a great article if appropriately updated. There are a few minor flaws, admitted, but it will mark our community for years to come.

Abstract

This paper, titled 'The Development of Business Organization Through the Effective Network Management. Case Study at SMEs Cluster in Indonesia,' finally addresses the problem of Interdisciplinary subjects in Social Science in Social Science. The approach is novel, and is well-described in the paper. The approach shows most excellent results across the board. This is a revolution in the making. The paper is lucidly and elegantly written.

Area

Interdisciplinary subjects in Social Science was, is, and will be one of the hottest areas of research in our community. It may be impactful in the stream; and as this paper condenses very good areas of the field, it is suitable for publishing.

Originality

This article may be considered as an add to a long line of research by Daryono Daryono at Mulawarman University which is some of the good research in [object HTMLInputElement]. The present submission can be seen as the cornerstone of this long term effort, bringing this work to full completion.

Approach

The approach is absolutely well-appreciated. It is good to see how the author(s) manage to fit all the details with all clarity within the page limit, yet can come up with realistic examples and a full-fledged evaluation. None of the results leaves the slightest question open. Kudos!

Evaluation

The evaluation shows the full benefits of the approach. The author(s) do a great effort in explaining the results; their novel usage of the particular points clearly demonstrates how the few outliers can be easily attributed. Overall, this is solid and significant work.

Limitations

The work seems to have no limitations as per the journal policy.

Reproducibility

Thanks to the clear writing and the instructions provided, this reviewer was able to reproduce all results. Approach turns out be simple, yet so novel and convincing.

Presentation

Beautifully written and commendable work. '

Typesetting (format) of the article is not compatible with our journal. A lot of efforts will be required to update the article. We will appreciate if you can update the article with our standard/LaTeX template, obtainable from Global Journals Incorporated, United States manuscript department. This will also help you at the time of early view.

Bibliography

The bibliography by itself could make a publication of its own. Each and every paper is carefully commented and related to the author's works. This reviewer especially liked the citations of the collected works of other author(s), and whose long-standing contributions to the community and the field are still under-appreciated.

Summary

Points in favor:
(+) Well-appreciated approach to Interdisciplinary subjects in Social Science in Social Science
(+) Impressive results
(+) Beautifully written

Points against:

(-) None

Recommendation

Acceptable in the current form!

Reviewer 1 Recommendation

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is recommended for publication).

Reviewer 2 Recommendation

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is recommended for publication).

Editorial Recommendation

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is accepted for publication).